Ham-Policy Digest   Tue, 16 Aug 94   Volume 94 : Issue 376

Today's Topics:
                           CW ...IS history!
                        Fake Stevie Nicks??????
                              ITU Treaty
                 Let's kick this idea around... (2 msgs)
                        New Thing to Kick Around
                   Slow Code Idea by Wayne Green (2 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 16 Aug 1994 10:53:34 +1000
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!msuinfo!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!
news.cs.su.oz.au!metro!news.ci.com.au!eram.esi.com.au!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ...IS history!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1fc.1093.2423@dreamscape.com>,
    hans.tenney@dreamscape.com (Hans Tenney) writes:

| -=> Quoting Michael P. Deignan to All <=-
|
|
| MPD> The FCC made a bo-bo. They shouldn't have called the new licence the
| MPD> "No-code technician" license. They should have called it the
| MPD> "Know-Nothing license".
|

```
|  As a recent Technician Class License holder, I would like to thank you
|  for your truly enlightened outlook on Amateur Radio for the future.

You mean, you haven't put Deignan into your killfile yet?

--
Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) | dave@esi.com.au | VK2KFU @ VK2AAB.NSW.AUS.OC | PGP 2.6
Opinions expressed are mine. | E7 FE 97 88 E5 02 3C AE  9C 8C 54 5B 9A D4 A0 CD
```

```
Date: Mon, 15 Aug 94 11:34:36 CDT
From: news.hal.COM!olivea!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!
zip.eecs.umich.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!usenet@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Fake Stevie Nicks??????
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
```

On Sun, 14 Aug 1994 14:40:33 GMT,
James Nalbandian <james.nalbandian@aznetig.stat.com> wrote:

<long description of left-field David Letterman/Stevie Nicks conspiracy
deleted>

Of course you are entitled to your opinions and beliefs, but what does this
have to do with ham radio? This should have been posted to
alt.conspiracies.

-Steve-
N9XDC

```
Date: Thu, 11 Aug 94 19:27:02 EDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!eff!
wariat.org!malgudi.oar.net!hypnos!voxbox!jgrubs@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ITU Treaty
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
```

twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu writes:

> Having a third-party administer tests will certainly eliminate some
> of the problems with VE testing, but I don't see it as the ultimate
> solution. (I don't have one of those yet, but when I do, I'll be
> sure and post it. :-) I think the possibility of bribery will still
> exist, plus the third-party could be more likely to bend the rules
> since they don't care what happens in the amateur bands. (There are
> arguements for both sides of this, but I'm not sure which has the

```
> better case.)
>
> >There are many modes, and perhaps a test for each one of them would be
> >too much hassle. However, we could break things down as follows:
> >
> >    1. HF digital (Amtor, Pactor, RTTY, etc.)
> >    2. SSB (all bands)
> >    3. CW (all bands)
> >    4. V/UHF FM voice
> >    5. V/UHF digital (TCP/IP, Packet)
> >    6. ATV / SSTV
> >    7. Microwave (special considerations since we don't want people
> >       to cook themselves)
>
> OK.  This is better.  There's not so many of them (seven plus the
> "intro" exam makes eight as opposed to the currect nine
> elements--including all three code elements), so it's a reasonable
> load.

I wonder if the FCC has this much of a pain in the butt with the other
services it regulates? As I recall it was this same kind of situation
that finally led to their "POOF -- everybody has a CB license"
solution. If this endless wrangling keeps on AND WE KEEP BOTHERING
_THEM_ WITH IT, they will say "Ham radio is a national park and
everybody is a camper." How 'bout that, boys and girls? 400,000,000
hamcampers in the USA alone? Then where will we be?

--
jgrubs@voxbox.norden1.com
'Two of the gravest general dangers to survival are the desire for
comfort and a passive outlook.' --  U.S. Army Ranger Handbook


------------------------------

Date: Thu, 11 Aug 94 19:17:37 EDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!eff!
wariat.org!malgudi.oar.net!hypnos!voxbox!jgrubs@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Let's kick this idea around...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu (prvalko) writes:

> Ok net.folk, what do you think of this...
>
> --- I hope you get the idea...
>
> It would be nice if you could just toss them the HT, put it on some
> obscure simplex frequency, perhaps a 440 UHF freq, run it on the
```

```
> ultra-low power mode say under a watt, lock the keypad, and let them
> use the rig LEGALLY.
>
> I would like to talk about a change to Part 97, that would permit
> hams to do this on a third-party basis.  These are some stipulations

Leave the situation the way it is -- do it and keep it to yourself.
Asking the FCC would unnecessarily provide an opportunity to say  NO!

(Of course, I suppose one could always buy some of those 49 mhz
dinguses. They'll do just what you're talking about perfectly legally.
Naw, that'd mean admitting ham radio isn't the only kind of personal
radio.)

--
jgrubs@voxbox.norden1.com
'Two of the gravest general dangers to survival are the desire for
comfort and a passive outlook.' --  U.S. Army Ranger Handbook


------------------------------

Date: Thu, 11 Aug 94 19:44:45 EDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!eff!
wariat.org!malgudi.oar.net!hypnos!voxbox!jgrubs@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Let's kick this idea around...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu (prvalko) writes:

> Well... I've gotten a ton of email and we've had some lively discussion
> here.
>
> *BUT*
>
> NOBODY has yet given one single objective reason why this proposal would

I'll give you the sort of reason the FCC would give you -- "There is no
compelling need to duplicate other existing services and use of these
other existing services would not constitute an unreasonable burden on
the users."




--
jgrubs@voxbox.norden1.com
'Two of the gravest general dangers to survival are the desire for
comfort and a passive outlook.' --  U.S. Army Ranger Handbook
```

```
------------------------------
```

OK, something to give us a break from the code wars:

Conjecture: All repeaters that ID using MCW are doing it
illegally....

OK, here are bits and pieces of PArt 97, with MY TWISTED
INTERPRETATIONS IN CAPS TO MAKE IT EASIER TO READ (i'm not trying to yell).

97.3 Definitions. - (a) The definitions of terms used in Part 97:
          (c)   The following terms are used in this part to indicate
emission types. Refer to 2.201 of the FCC Rules, Emission, modulation and
transmission characteristics, for information on emission type
designators.

          (1)   CW. International Morse code telegraphy emissions
having designators with A, C, H, J or R as the first symbol; 1 as the
second symbol; A or B as the third symbol; and emissions J2A and J2B.

          (4)   MCW. Tone-modulated international Morse code
telegraphy emissions having designators with A, C, D, F, G, H or R as the
first symbol; 2 as the second symbol; A or B as the third symbol.

****

OK, SO THE "BEEPING" ON THE REPEATERS IS MCW....

****

          (5)   Phone. Speech and other sound emissions having
designators with A, C, D, F, G, H, J or R as the first symbol; 1, 2 or 3
as the second symbol; E as the third symbol. Also speech emissions having
B as the first symbol; 7, 8 or 9 as the second symbol; E as the third
symbol. MCW for the purpose of performing the station identification
procedure, or for providing telegraphy practice interspersed with speech.
Incidental tones for the purpose of selective calling or alerting or to
control the level of a demodulated signal may also be considered phone.

```
**************************************************

OK, SO MCW TO PERFORM STATION ID IS CONSIDERED TO BE A "PHONE" EMISSION...

**************************************************

        97.119 Station identification. -

        (b)      The call sign must be transmitted with an emission
authorized for the transmitting channel in one of the following ways:

        (1)      By a CW emission.  When keyed by an automatic
device used only for identification, the speed must not exceed 20 words
per minute;

        (2)      By a phone emission in the English language.  Use
of a phonetic alphabet as an aid for correct station identification is
encouraged;
        (3)      By a RTTY emission using a specified digital code
when all or part of the communications are transmitted by a RTTY or data
emission;

        (4)      By an image emission conforming to the applicable
transmission standards, either color or monochrome, of 73.682(a) of
the FCC Rules when all or part of the communications are transmitted in
the same image emission; or

        (5)      By a CW or phone emission during SS emission
transmission on a narrow bandwidth frequency segment.  Alternatively, by
the changing of one or more parameters of the emission so that a
conventional CW or phone emission receiver can be used to determine the
station call sign.

**************************************************

SEEING THAT MCW IS PHONE, IT FALLS UNDER (2), AND IT REQUIRES THAT
PHONE EMISSIONS BE IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.  SO, DOES THAT MEAN THAT
INTERNATIONAL MORSE == ENGLISH LANGUAGE, OR DOES IT MEAN THAT MCW
ID OF REPEATERS (AND ANYTHING ELSE) IS ILLEGAL?

Could it mean that Morse is a language?????  (oh oh, that's back to
the code wars).....

Anxiously awaiting replies.

                    ==Ken

p.s.  the above is merely to give us something else to ponder.
```

Please don't lose sleep over this -- it is merely Part97 entertainment,
which we all love so much.

Date: Mon, 15 Aug 1994 15:05:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Slow Code Idea by Wayne Green
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <lenwink.173.0007B12B@indirect.com> lenwink@indirect.com (Len Winkler)
writes:
>On the 8/14/94 edition of Ham Radio & More, Wayne Green, Publisher of 73
>Magazine said that there should be only 1 license for amateur radio allowing
>you all priviledges. It should require 5 wpm code knowledge and be more
>technical than today's tests. What do you think?

It's a step in the right direction.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us

Date: Mon, 15 Aug 94 20:51:05 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Slow Code Idea by Wayne Green
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Wayne lost the incentive licensing battle thirty years ago but just can't
give it up.

Date: Mon, 15 Aug 1994 14:51:33 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3284ps$sdr@apakabar.cc.columbia.edu>,
<1994Aug10.172800.16831@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <32ej9e$a2u@apakabar.cc.columbia.edu>

In article <32ej9e$a2u@apakabar.cc.columbia.edu> jbaltz@ciao.cc.columbia.edu
(Jerry B Altzman) writes:
>In article <1994Aug10.172800.16831@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
>Gary Coffman <gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> spake:
>
>[...previous conversation deleted...]
>>   I'm suggesting open book so that things
>>that can easily be looked up in a book, can be, demonstrating the candidate
>>at least understands the issues sufficiently to know where and how to find
>>the answers.
>
>Again, a reasonable idea, if you're going to be testing on specific things,
>not general concepts. General concepts can (and should!) be memorized.
>There's no excuse for not knowing Ohm's Law (but no extra credit for
>knowing where it doesn't apply any more :-) but should we really be asking
>them about J. Random transistor on the exam? (why else would you need the
>book)

I subscribe to the philosophy exposed by Albert Einstein. There is no
need to clutter your mind with memorized formulas and constants when
Handbooks are so plentiful. As long as you have a fundamental grasp
of what you're trying to do, there's nothing wrong with using the book
to keep track of the mechanical minutia of calculation.

>Of course, we haven't even TOUCHED regulations. With the (possible)
>exception of frequency limits, I would require those to be memorized--you
>should just KNOW automatically when something is right or wrong, not have
>to say on-air "hold on, I think this isn't quite right".

Again I disagree. While I want the applicant to have a general knowledge
of the tenor of regulation, I'm satisfied if he can find and quote the
appropriate section from the book when needed. Everybody is supposed to
have a current copy of the rules at their station, so there's no need
to memorize, just a need to understand the general tenor of the regulations
so that when questions arise, and they do even for FCC field engineers,
they'll have an idea how to consult the rules for a definite answer.

>>   I would like the applicant to have
>>a good grasp of electrical safety, a grasp of how to recognize and deal with
>>spurious and parasitic signals, how to determine bandwidth and how to measure
>>frequency and power, and some solid knowledge of the rules of the road. I
>>don't think that's asking too much of people who will be authorized to design,
>>build, or repair their own equipment. Frankly, if all they can do is give
>>the number for Kenwood's repair depot, I don't think they belong in amateur
>>radio. CB, GMRS, and cellular phone were designed for those people.

>
>Darn tootin'! We don't need any of those who want to do public service
>cluttering up our bands, right? Oops, sorry, your elitism is showing again,
>Gary :-)
>
>I'm sorry, Gary, but here you're trying to restrict the club to engineers
>again, or at the _very least_ give a "final exam" instead of the "entrance
>exam" you keep claiming it should be. Building and repairing is somewhat
>self-selective in the service: most of those who do that type of thing will
>learn (by necessity) how to do testing.
>
>Certainly as an entrance topic we should teach electrical safety. Don't aim
>a microwave waveguide at your head. Don't touch both sides of a switch at
>the same time. Don't jam your fingers at that big capacitor in your power
>supply. Run a straight, eight-inch copper strap from your antenna mast to a
>ground rod driven at least eight feet in. As well, one should have to have
>some idea what it means when things go awry (e.g. spurs).
>
>But, at the same time, we have to realize that ham radio is still a hobby,
>not a life's pursuit for everyone involved. Not everyone has a deep
>interest in all matters of electronics, and there's room for those in the
>service as well (Remember: we can't all be busy experimenting, someone has
>to be out there doing the public service, since in the government's eyes,
>that is our _raison d'etre_. Certainly we've proven time and time again
>that we're no good replacement for the RF industry.) Thus, we have to
>temper our desire to have everyone be gEEks with the reality that not
>everyone is, or even should be.

I believe you are overreacting, perhaps because some of these concepts
are foreign to your experience. All I'm asking is that the applicant
have a passing familiarity with Articles 200, 800, and 810 of the
National Electrical Code, and know when to consult the Code book when
issues of electrical installation occur. I don't expect them to be able
to parrot the Code back to me on demand.

I *do* expect them to know the ANSI exposure limits, at least to the
point of knowing how and when to look them up in the book, and how
to make measurements and calculations to ensure compliance.

Mostly, I want them to demonstrate a *practical* understanding of
how to notice when things have gone awry. A good example from a
current thread is finding different VSWR readings on an antenna
coax at varying distances along the cable. This should raise a
red flag in the applicant's mind. I don't expect him to then
regurgitate transmisson line theory, but I do expect him to know
how and where to look up the needed information to deal with
the problem.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us

Date: 15 Aug 1994 16:01:37 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!dancer.ca.sandia.gov!cronkite.nersc.gov!osi-
east2.es.net!lll-winken.llnl.gov!koriel!olivea!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!zip.@@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <081194182202Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CuJywr.LGn@world.std.com>,
<1994Aug15.110241.1@aspen.uml.edu>nel.ecs
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

martinja@aspen.uml.edu wrote:

: Seems to me that if the control op had the capability to remotely stop the
: operation of the radio being used by the non-ham the operation could be
: legal. DTMF control or whatever.   BEEEEEEP!--Other radio shuts down.

Uhhh... I just thought this out a couple hours ago. A DTMF controllable
can NOT be shut off remotely while it is transmitting. So I guess that
idea won't work.

=paul= wbz8jl

Date: 15 Aug 1994 18:09:49 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.cs.columbia.edu!news.columbia.edu!watsun.cc.columbia.edu!
jbaltz@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Aug10.172800.16831@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<32ej9e$a2u@apakabar.cc.columbia.edu>, <1994Aug15.145133.12309@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>¿í
Subject : Re: Isn't Amateur Radio a Hobby?

Since this has "deteriorated" to a conversation between us, let's take it to
the "hamexam" list, unless someone else really objects.

//jbaltz
jerry b. altzman   Entropy just isn't what it used to be   +1 212 650 5617

jbaltz@columbia.edu   jbaltz@sci.ccny.cuny.edu   KE3ML   (HEPNET) NEVIS::jbaltz

----

Date: 15 Aug 94 11:02:41 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
jobone!news1.oakland.edu!vtc.tacom.army.mil!ulowell!ulowell!aspen.uml.edu!
martinja@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <32b5vi$n3f@hacgate2.hac.com>, <081194182202Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<CuJywr.LGn@world.std.com>m.
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

In article <CuJywr.LGn@world.std.com>, drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker)
wrote:

[snippeth, snippeth]

> The trick is making sure you really have control.

Seems to me that if the control op had the capability to remotely stop the
operation of the radio being used by the non-ham the operation could be
legal. DTMF control or whatever.   BEEEEEEP!--Other radio shuts down.

What thinkest thou?

73 de WK1V
   -jim-

Date: 15 Aug 1994 12:46:04 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!vela.acs.oakland.edu!
prvalko@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Aug9.182240.17073@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<329ivd$m3s@oak.oakland.edu>, <rogjdCuKrr7.3w4@netcom.com>.acs.o
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

Roger Buffington (rogjd@netcom.com) wrote:

: I think your idea is a poor one. In my opinion it addresses a
: non-problem anyway. The circumstances you outline are not common. Right
: now, FCC administrative time/resources must be viewed as a SCARCE
: resource for amateur radio. I can think of a zillion things I'd rather

: have the FCC focus on. (Straightening out the digital sub bands, for
: instance.)

IMHO, the digital sub-band is a non-problem, because I don't use 'em,
same reason you think that the proposal I outlined is a non-issue, you
believe it is an uncommon situation, yet I KNOW I can't go a week
without the thought hitting me and saying... I SHOULD be able to do
that.

: I also hate the idea of non-hams on the bands, on principle.

How do you live with yourself when ayou tune 20M and hear all the
phone patch activities... not to mention the autopatch on the repeater?
Non hams are on the bands (under control ops, same as my proposal) today.

73

=paul= wb8zjl

NOTE TO EVERYONE : I hope you all are enjoying this topic as much as I
                  am. Sure is refreshing to see some intelligent
                  discussion on here for a change.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #376
****